

## REMARKS

REST AVAILABLE COPY

Claims 1-19 are pending, including independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 16-19. Claim 16 has been allowed.

The Examiner again rejected claims 1-15 and 17-19 under 35 § 102(e) as anticipated by Kaplan. However, Applicant submits that his invention is patentable over Kaplan and has further amended independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 17-19 to clarify certain distinctions over Kaplan, as explained in more detail below.

Applicant's invention is generally directed to more effective ways of presenting POI information on the display of a vehicle navigation system. Independent claims 1 and 17 describe a method and a system, respectively, for displaying POIs in each of a plurality of categories by using a distinctive icon for each category, and then displaying the particular type of POI within a category when a specific POI icon is selected on the map image. Thus, the use of a common icon for a category facilitates recognition of the locations of various POIs in a particular category, yet the particular type of POI within the category can be found easily, when desired, in an orderly fashion.

This is not disclosed by Kaplan. Kaplan describes a system and method that allows a user to specify a type of point of interest at which the user wishes to make an intermediate stop while on route to a final destination (see Abstract; col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 9). Kaplan does not provide distinct icons for different POI categories displayed on a map image as does Applicant's invention. To the contrary, Kaplan simply displays a generic mark (i.e., an "X") at the location of all POIs (see Figs. 3, 16).

In his *Response to Arguments* section (Office Action at p. 8), the Examiner explained the rejection further by equating the distinctive icons in Applicant's claims to the different category names in Figs. 5-9 of Kaplan. Applicant traverses this rejection by the present clarifying amendments to claims 1 and 17 which recite that POIs are displayed on the map image by the POI icons, and the particular type of POI within a category is displayed when the POI icon is selected on the map image. Figs. 5-9 of Kaplan merely illustrate menus that include names of POI categories and sub-

categories, but do not show distinctive POI icons displayed on a map image or that a POI icon on a map image can be selected in order to display the particular type of POI within the category. On the other hand, Figs. 3 and 16 of Kaplan, which show map images having an "X" at every POI location, do not show different POI icons for each category. Therefore, Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 17 patentability distinguish over Kaplan.

Independent claims 6 and 18 describe a method and a system, respectively, for displaying by a common icon only those POIs in a category having a preset type, and displaying the type of POI when a specific POI icon is selected. This embodiment provides the advantages of the first embodiment and, in addition, reduces unnecessary clutter on the display by not displaying POI icons for types of POI in a category that the user knows beforehand he or she does not want. Claims 6 and 18 have been amended like claims 1 and 17 and distinguish over Kaplan for at least the same reasons explained above for claims 1 and 17.

Independent claims 11 and 19 describe a method and a system, respectively, for displaying an index containing at least one POI located within an area indicated by a cursor as well as a location corresponding to the cursor instructing point, and selecting a particular POI or the location corresponding to the cursor instruction point from the index. This embodiment is useful when the scale of the displayed map is small or the density of POIs is large, so that a list of POIs within an area designated by the cursor and a location corresponding to the cursor instructing point itself (e.g., at the cross intersection of a cursor) are displayed, and the desired POI or the location corresponding to the cursor instructing point can be reliably selected by a user. Claims 11 and 19 have been amended to clarify the invention.


Kaplan does not disclose this subject matter. The Examiner points to Figs. 5-9 of Kaplan as showing a cursor indicating a predetermined area and a cursor instructing point, but Applicant disagrees. Those Figures show various menus for selecting POIs, but show no cursor that is movable relative to a displayed map (as recited in claims 11 and 19), much less any details concerning the cursor. The Examiner also points to Fig.

COPY

16, which does show a map image and a circle 268 that can be moved by a user to highlight a point of interest. However, Fig. 16 and the accompanying text do not disclose that the circle 268 has a cursor instructing point, and do not describe or suggest that an index is displayed which comprises the name(s) of at least one POI located in a predetermined area indicated by the cursor and a location corresponding to a cursor instructing point.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-15 and 17-19, as amended herein, are patentable over the cited art and requests reconsideration and allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James P. Naughton  
Registration No. 30,665  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200